

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 02646 131330Z

50

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 ERDE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00

INRE-00 USIE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-10

L-02 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 BIB-01 EURE-00 /082 W

----- 119021

O R 131229Z MAY 75 ZFF-4

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1769

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T USNATO 2646

E.O. 11652: XGDS-1

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJ: MBFR: DATA ISSUES: SPC MEETING MAY 12

REF: (A) STATE 103599 (B) STATE 105973 (C) USNATO 2551

(D) USNATO 2361

SUMMARY: AT MAY 12 SPC MEETING, UK JOINED THE CONSENSUS WHICH HAD FORMED AT PREVIOUS MEETING BEHIND U.S. POSITION THAT CURRENT NAC GUIDANCE IS ADEQUATE TO ALLOW AHG TO BEGIN DISCUSSION OF DEFINITIONS AND DATA WITH THE EAST, AND THAT THIS GUIDANCE GIVES AHG AUTHORITY TO DISCLOSE CURRENT GROUND AND AIR MANPOWER TOTALS IN A RECIPROCAL DISCUSSION OF DATA. UK DID NOT RENEW ITS COMMENT ON DESIRABILITY OF WORK ON GUIDANCE RE COUNTRY BY COUNTRY BREAKDOWN. SPC WILL NOT BEGIN WORK ON LATTER SUBJECT IN VIEW OF STRONG FRG, BELGIAN, DUTCH, AND CANADIAN OPPOSITION TO SUCH WORK AT THIS TIME. UK PROPOSED MILITARY TECHNICAL ANALYSIS IN MBFR WORKING GROUP ON USE OF MORE DETAILED DATA WITH THE
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 02646 131330Z

OTHER SIDE. FRG, BELGIAN, DUTCH, U.S., AND CANADIAN REPS CRITICIZED THIS PROPOSAL. END SUMMARY

1. UK REP (BAILES) SAID THAT THE UK AGREED THAT THE AHG

HAS SUFFICIENT NAC GUIDANCE TO BEGIN A DISCUSSION OF DATA AND DEFINITIONS WITH THE EAST. UK FURTHER AGREED THAT THIS GUIDANCE PERMITTED AHG TO DISCLOSE GROUND AND AIR MANPOWER TOTALS IN A SERIOUS RECIPROCAL DISCUSSION ON DATA. THE AHG IS THE BEST JUDGE OF WHEN A SERIOUS DISCUSSION EXISTS. THE UK CONTINUES TO BELIEVE THAT IT WOULD NOT HELP FOR THE AHG TO VOLUNTEER DATA, SINCE THE EAST MAY STILL TRY TO ESCAPE A GENUINE DATA EXCHANGE.

2. UK REP SAID THAT THE UK AGREES WITH THE OTHER ALLIES THAT IT WAS NOT NECESSARY FOR SPC TO WORK ON GUIDANCE TO THE AHG ON USE OF MORE DETAILED DATA WITH THE EAST. HOWEVER, UK BELIEVES THAT ALLIES WILL EVENTUALLY HAVE TO FACE UP TO THIS ISSUE. UK BELIEVES IT USEFUL IF SOME MILITARY GROUND WORK WERE DONE IN ADVANCE OF WHEN SPC MIGHT NEED TO CONSIDER GUIDANCE TO AHG. UK THEREFORE PROPOSED THAT THE MBFR WORKING GROUP UNDERTAKE A STUDY ON USE OF MORE DETAILED DATA, FROM THE MILITARY TECHNICAL VIEWPOINT. UK REP CIRCULATED THE FOLLOWING MANDATE, WHICH UK SUGGESTED THAT THE SPC GIVE TO THE MBFR WORKING GROUP;

3. BEGIN TEXT:

AS STATED IN PARA. 5 OF THE UK DELEGATION NOTE OF 28 APRIL (REF D), THE UK BELIEVES THAT THE ALLIANCE SHOULD BEGIN TO CONSIDER ON A CONTINGENCY BASIS THE QUESTION OF HOW ALLIED NEGOTIATORS CAN EFFECTIVELY RESPOND TO DETAILED WARSAW PACT CHALLENGES ON THE CORRECTNESS OF DATA TABLED BY THE WEST. IN VIEW OF THE HIGH SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF MUCH OF THE DATA CONCERNED, THE SUBJECT REQUIRES VERY CAREFUL MILITARY CONSIDERATION. WE SUGGEST, THEREFORE, THAT AS A FIRST STEP AND TO AID FURTHER SPC DEBATE, THE WORKING GROUP SHOULD BE REQUESTED FORTHWITH TO STUDY THE FOLLOWING QUESTION:

HOW FAR AND IN WHAT WAY SHOULD ALLIED NEGOTIATORS RESPOND TO EASTERN CHALLENGES ON THE FOLLOWING NATO ESTIMATES OF MANPOWER AND EQUIPMENT TOTALS (IN ORDER OF PRIORITY):

- (I) WARSAW PACT/SOVIET GROUND FORCE MANPOWER
- (II) WARSAW PACT TANK STRENGTHS IN ACTIVE UNITS
- (III) WARSAW PACT RESERVE TANK HOLDINGS

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 02646 131330Z

- (IV) WARSAW PACT AREA AIR DEFENCE MANPOWER
- (V) WARSAW PACT HELICOPTER MANPOWER
- (VI) NATO/US GROUND FORCE MANPOWER
- (VII) NATO TANK STRENGTH IN ACTIVE UNITS
- (VIII) NATO RESERVE TANK HOLDINGS.

NOTE: IN CONNECTION WITH ITEMS (III) AND (VIII) ABOVE, AND IN THE LIGHT OF CRITICISMS OF ALLIED TANK ESTIMATES ALREADY VOICED BY THE EAST, THE WORKING GROUP MAY ALSO WISH TO CONSIDER THE MILITARY/TECHNICAL IMPLICATIONS OF INCLUDING RESERVE TANK HOLDINGS IN ANY ESTIMATES OF NATO OR WARSAW PACT TANK STRENGTHS TO BE USED IN THE NEGOTIATIONS.

4. BELGIAN REP (WILLOT) NOTED THAT ONLY TWO OF THE RUBRICS IN THE UK LIST CONCERNED GROUND FORCE MANPOWER. HE NOTED THAT THE ALLIED POSITION PRESENTLY CALLS FOR REDUCTIONS IN GROUND FORCE MANPOWER, WITH A NON-INCREASE COMMITMENT ON AIR MANPOWER BETWEEN PHASES. HE ASKED IF UK PROPOSAL DID NOT SUGGEST FUTURE MODIFICATION OF THE ALLIED POSITION. UK REP REPLIED THAT IT DID NOT, AND THAT THE UK WAS ONLY LOOKING FOR WAYS TO RESPOND TO POSSIBLE WP CHALLENGES ON THE CORRECTNESS OF ALLIED DATA.

5. FRG REP (HOYNCK) SAID THAT IN PRINCIPLE, FRG WAS NOT AGAINST ADVANCE PREPARATION FOR FUTURE GUIDANCE. HOWEVER, HE WISHED TO POINT OUT ON A PERSONAL BASIS THAT THE UK WAS PROPOSING THAT THE MBFR WORKING GROUP PREPARE HYPOTHETICAL ANSWERS TO HYPOTHETICAL QUESTIONS. IT WOULD BE VERY DIFFICULT TO TRY TO ANTICIPATE DIRECTION THAT THE PACT'S CHALLENGES MAY TAKE, AND SUCH AN EFFORT

MIGHT BE COUNTER-PRODUCTIVE. IN ADDITION, PUTTING SUCH QUESTIONS TO THE WORKING GROUP MIGHT GIVE THE AHG THE IMPRESSION OF WORK ON A FALL-BACK POSITION. HE THOUGHT THAT ANY QUESTIONS TO THE WORKING GROUP IN THIS REGARD SHOULD BE VERY PRECISE.

6. NETHERLANDS REP (MEESMAN) SAID THAT HE WAS CONCERNED WITH THE EQUIPMENT ELEMENT IN THE UK PROPOSAL. HE SAID THAT HIS AUTHORITIES ARE VERY CAUTIOUS ABOUT ANY EXCHANGE OF EQUIPMENT DATA.

7. US REP (MOORE) REITERATED US VIEW THAT IT IS NOT NECESSARY TO CONSIDER GUIDANCE ON MORE DETAILED DATA AT THIS TIME, AND US WISH NOT TO ENGAGE IN EXCHANGE OF EQUIPMENT DATA WITH THE EAST,
SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 02646 131330Z

BECAUSE THIS MIGHT INDICATE WILLINGNESS TO DISCUSS REDUCTIONS OF WESTERN ARMAMENTS. HE THOUGHT THAT IT WAS IMPOSSIBLE TO FORESEE IN WHAT POLITICAL CONTEXT THE ALLIES MIGHT WISH TO CONSIDER GUIDANCE ON MORE DETAILED DATA, AND THAT IT WOULD BE VERY DIFFICULT TO SEPARATE POLITICAL FROM MILITARY-TECHNICAL ASPECTS OF THE PROBLEM.

8. CANADIAN REP (BARTLEMAN) SAID THAT THE UK-PROPOSED MANDATE FOR THE WORKING GROUP SEEMED TO HIM TO BE A PROPOSAL FOR AN ESSENTIALLY POLITICAL EXERCISE IN THE MBFR WORKING GROUP, WHICH WOULD BE CONTRARY TO THE WORKING GROUP'S ROLE OF STUDYING MILITARY-TECHNICAL QUESTIONS.

9. MC REP AND WORKING GROUP CHAIRMAN (SMITH) SAID THAT IF THE SPC GAVE THE WG A MANDATE IN THIS AREA, THE MANDATE SHOULD BE VERY PRECISE. AS HE SAW IT, THE UK WAS ESSENTIALLY PROPOSING THAT THE WG IDENTIFY THE MAKE-UP OF FIGURES WHICH COULD BE USED TO RESPOND TO PACT CHALLENGES OF TABLED ALLIED DATA, AND TO PUT A SECURITY CLASSIFICATION ON SUCH FIGURES.

10. UK REP THOUGHT THAT MC REP WAS CORRECT IN HIS VIEW OF WHAT THE UK WAS PROPOSING. SHE SAID THAT UK WOULD WELCOME ANY SUG-

GESTIONS TO MAKE THE WG MANDATE PRECISE. SHE STATED THAT THE UK WAS WORKING ON A DETILED PAPER, WHICH THE UK COULD TABLE IN THE MBFR WG BY NEXT TUESDAY (MAY 20), IF SPC GIVES THE WG A MANDATE.

11. ACTION REQUESTED: WASHINGTON VIEW ON THE UK PROPOSAL FOR WG MILITARY-TCHNICAL ANALYSIS IN PARA 3 ABOVE IN TIME FOR SPC MEETING ON THURSDAY, MAY 15. THE GENERAL VIEW IN SPC IS CLEARLY THAT IF THE SPC GIVES THE WG ANY MANDATE AT ALL, THAT MANDATE SHOULD BE VERY PRECISE.BRUCE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 13 MAY 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: GolinoFR
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO02646
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 XGDS-1
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750599/abbrzjyb.tel
Line Count: 175
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: (A) STATE 103599 (B) STATE 105973 (C) USNATO 2551 (D) USNATO 2361
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: GolinoFR
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 03 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <03 APR 2003 by ElyME>; APPROVED <07 APR 2003 by GolinoFR>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
05 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: DATA ISSUES: SPC MEETING MAY 12
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA
BONN
LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006